UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,372	10/24/2003	Dany Sylvain	7000-283	9487

27820 7590 01/16/2007

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 1287
CARY, NC 27512

EXAMINER	
TRAN, TUAN A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2618	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/693,372	SYLVAIN, DANY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Tran	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *6* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the telephony line interface" should be changed to "the wireline telephony interface" for consistency. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 16-20, 22-24, 28-30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bosik et al. (7,046,783).

Regarding claim 1, Bosik discloses a docking station 105 for a mobile terminal (See fig. 4), comprising: a signaling interface 710; a mobile terminal interface 715 adapted to detect when the mobile terminal is proximate to the docking station 105; and control system 745 associated with the signaling interface 710 and the mobile terminal interface 715 and adapted to: send a first signal via the signaling interface 710 when the mobile terminal becomes proximate to the docking station 105; and send a second signal via the signaling interface 710 when the mobile terminal is no longer proximate to

the docking station105, the first and second signals being used to determine how incoming calls intended for a user associated with the mobile terminal and the docking station 105 are routed (See figs. 2, 4 and col. 3 lines 29-54).

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1, as method.

Regarding claim 2, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 1. Bosik further discloses the signaling interface is a wireline telephony interface adapted to interact with a wireline switch (See figs. 2, 4 and col. 3 lines 40-43).

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 2, as method.

Regarding claim 3, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 2. Bosik further discloses a dual tone multi-frequency generator associated with the wireline telephony interface and the control system, adapted to generate the first and second signals as a series of dialed digits (See figs. 2, 4 and col.3 lines 40-43col. 2 lines 41-55).

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 3, as method.

Regarding claim 4, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 3. Bosik further discloses the first and second signals are special feature codes (See col. 2 lines 41-55 and col. 3 lines 45-47).

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 4, as method.

Regarding claim 5, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 3. Bosik further discloses the first and second signals are directory numbers (See col. 2 lines 41-55 and col. 3 line 40-54).

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 5, as method.

Regarding claim 6, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 2. Bosik further discloses a wireline terminal interface 705 for connecting a wireline terminal, the wireline terminal interface 705 coupled to the wireline telephony interface (See figs. 2, 4).

Regarding claims 8-9, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 1. Bosik further discloses the first and second signals are unique or identical (See col. 2 lines 41-55).

Claims 22-23 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 8-9, as method.

Regarding claim 10, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 1. Bosik further discloses the mobile terminal interface comprises a recharging interface for recharging a battery of the mobile terminal when the mobile terminal is proximate to the docking station 105 (See fig. 4 and col. 5 lines 9-14).

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 10, as method.

Regarding claims 28-30, Bosik discloses a method for routing calls to a most appropriate telephony terminal of a user comprising: receiving docking indicia indicative of a mobile terminal being proximate to a docking station; receiving undocking indicia indicative of the mobile terminal not being proximate to the docking station; receiving incoming call indicia indicative of an incoming call intended for at least one telephony terminal associated with the user, the at least one telephony terminal including the mobile terminal; determining how to route the incoming call based on the docking and undocking indicia(s); and effecting routing of the incoming call, wherein the incoming call is routed to a most appropriate telephony terminal or through a most appropriate network based on whether the mobile terminal is proximate to the docking station; and

wherein the docking and undocking indicia(s) are received from a wireline switch, which is coupled to the docking station (See figs. 2, 4 and col.2 lines 41-55, col. 3 lines 29-54).

Regarding claims 32-33, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 28. Bosik further discloses routing the incoming call to the mobile terminal through the docking station via a wireline switch coupled to the docking station when the mobile terminal is proximate to the docking station and routing the incoming call to a wireline terminal coupled to the docking station or coupled to a telephony line connected to the docking station when the mobile terminal is proximate to the docking station (See figs. 2,4 and col. 3 lines 29-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosik et al. (7,046,783) in view of Cardina (6,151,500) and further in view of Appelman (7,031,698).

Regarding claim 7, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 1. However, Bosik does not mention that a service node provides call routing instructions to the wireline switch and the signaling interface is a packet-based interface adapted to interact with the service node over packet network. Cardina suggests a method and apparatus for directing a wireless communication to a wireline unit wherein a service node (SCP) provides routing instructions to the most appropriate end office (EO) (See fig. 1 and col. 11 lines

29-59) and Appelman suggests a docking station comprising a packet-based interface for contacting with the service node to initiate/cancel call forwarding for a mobile communication device (See fig. 1 and col. 6 line 53 to col. 7 line 67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system as disclosed by Bosik in accordance to Cardina's suggestion for the advantage of effectively routing calls and further to configure the docking station as disclosed by Bosik with packet-based interface as suggested by Appelman for the advantage of expanding the capability of the docking station to various types of communication protocols.

Claim 21 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 7, as method.

3. Claim 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosik et al. (7,046,783) in view of Appelman (7,031,698).

Regarding claim 31, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 28. However, Bosik does not mention that the docking and undocking indicia are received from the docking station over a packet network. Appelman teaches a docking station comprising a packet-based interface for contacting with the service node to initiate/cancel call forwarding for a mobile communication device (See fig. 1 and col. 6 line 53 to col. 7 line 67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the docking station as disclosed by Bosik with the packet-based interface for sending docking and undocking indicia(s) (initiate or cancel

call forwarding feature) for the advantage of expanding the capability of the docking station to various types of communication protocols.

4. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosik et al. (7,046,783) in view of Torrey et al. (6,466,799).

Regarding claim 11-13, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 1. Bosik further discloses the mobile terminal interface 715 makes a physical connection to the mobile terminal (See fig. 4). However, Bosik does not mention that the mobile terminal interface comprises a communication interface adapted to cooperate with the control system to facilitate calls with the mobile terminal via the signaling interface. Torrey suggests a docking station comprising a communication interface 210 adapted to cooperate with the control system 223 of the docking station to facilitate calls with the mobile terminal via the wireline telephony interface (See fig. 2A and col. 4 line 14 to col. 5 line 49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the mobile terminal interface as suggested by Torrey for the advantage of allowing to place or receive simultaneous telephone calls over wireless and wireline networks from wireline terminal.

5. Claims 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosik et al. (7,046,783) in view of Wonak et al. (6,778,824).

Regarding claim 11 and 14, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 1. However, Bosik does not mention that the mobile terminal interface comprises a communication

interface adapted to facilitate local wireless communications with the mobile terminal. Wonak suggests a docking station comprising a communication interface 20 adapted to facilitate local wireless communications with the mobile terminal (See figs. 1-2 and col. 4 line 53 to col. 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the communication interface as suggested by Wonak for the advantage of expanding the capability of the docking station to various communication protocols such as wireless.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosik et al. (7,046,783) in view of Curtiss et al. (7,110,789).

Regarding claim 15, Bosik discloses as cited in claim 1. However, Bosik does not mention that an indicator associated with the control system and adapted to alert the user when the mobile terminal is proximate to the docking station. Curtiss suggests a docking station comprising an indicator 210 associated with a control system and adapted to alert a user when the mobile terminal is proximate to the docking station (See fig. 1 and col. 4 lines 59-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the docking station as disclosed by Bosik with the indicator as suggested by Curtiss for the advantage of allowing the user to know whether the mobile terminal is properly proximate to the docking station.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7858. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:00AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tuan Tran
AU 2618